



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,824	04/27/2001	Mieko Tanaka	109358	8472

25944 7590 12/17/2003  
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/842,824	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TANAKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lawrence D Ferguson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1774	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 26 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: 15, 17-20 and 22-24.

Claim(s) rejected: 13, 14, 16, 21 and 25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues Usami does not disclose plural lenses in concentric relation. Figure 2A shows the lens layer (16) in a concentric form having a common center (18). Applicant argues that Usami does not teach a ridgy resin film. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant admits a recording medium comprising a disk-shape substrate made of transparent resin with a circular hold provided at the center of the substrate, with a resin film constituted of a ridge formed around the hole (page 1, lines 10-25) with Figure 9 showing the ridgy resin film raised above the surface of a resin layer. Applicant argues the combination of Usami and Applicants' admission would not provide the claimed invention because the result would not be a ridgy resin film formed on the land where the first and second concaves share a common center. Examiner respectfully disagrees because Applicants' admission is incorporated simply to show the conventionality of ridgy resin film raised above the surface of a resin layer in a recording medium, where both teachings comprise a common center, which is the center of a hole in the recording medium.

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant submits claim 12 should be considered in the application. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden. The search of the 2 classes and subclasses would entail the requisite serious burden as the search for method of making is not the same as the article search. Additionally, the steps used in the method claims would not be expected to appear in the class/subclass of the product claims. Every optical disk is not made using the same method steps.

Applicant requests rejoinder of Group I invention and Group II invention under M.P.E.P 821.04. Where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. See MPEP § 806.05(f) and § 806.05(h). The claims to the non-elected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142. See MPEP § 809.02(c) and § 821 through § 821.03. However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL..

CRISTINA M. KELLY  
SUPERVISOR OF PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 100

